

A-2875 - Application No. 09/981,847
Response to Office action September 1, 2011
Response submitted October 26, 2011

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1 and 5-11 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 2 was previously cancelled. Claims 3, 4, 12, and 13 are being cancelled herewith.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 10-12 stand rejected as being obvious over Sridhar (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,108) in view of Collin et al. (International Publication No. WO 00/49501) (hereinafter "Collin") and Waite et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,688,170) (hereinafter "Waite") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in claims 3 and 4 of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

displaying a specified number of diagnostic programs for monitoring a printing press connected to the second computing unit, selecting and starting one of the diagnostic programs via the first computing unit, transmitting results of the one diagnostic program to the first computing unit, and providing a table wherein diagnostic programs are assigned to specified printing presses, so that when establishing a connection, the diagnostic programs pertaining to a correct one of the specified printing presses are displayed for selection.

Claim 1 now includes the display of a specified number of diagnostic programs for monitoring printing presses, the selection of one of the diagnostic programs and the transmission of the results of the selected diagnostic program.

Furthermore, the diagnostic programs are assigned to specified printing presses. Therefore, when establishing a connection, the diagnostic programs pertaining to the specified printing press are displayed for selection. Accordingly, several diagnostic programs for printing presses are provided, each diagnostic program being appropriate to monitor a certain kind of printing press and that if a connection to a specific printing press is established the correct corresponding diagnostic programs that are compatible with the specific

printing press are displayed for selection. As such, only compatible diagnostic programs are displayed and the diagnostic programs are specified for the specific printing press. The feature is important because printing presses can have completely different configurations, even printing presses within the same model series. For example, a printing press can have from 4 to 16 printing units, a coating unit, a sheet-turn device, etc. Such customized configurations are not known in connection with printers that are used in offices in connection with PCs. Accordingly, for such standard computer printers there is only one diagnostic program for a printer series.

Nevertheless, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 as being obvious over Sridhar and Collin in view of Waite. However, as will be seen from the following remarks, the rejection is improper and claim 1 is not obvious over Sridhar and Collin in view of Waite. Specifically, with respect to selecting one of several diagnostic programs, the Examiner refers to Collin page 3, line 1 to page 5, line 26 (which is not very specific). However, the citation is not relevant either. Page 3 of Colin only refers to a communication that is established between at least a client module and a server module and the information passed from at least a client module including passing information from at least one client

module to the server module. On page 4, lines 3 to 5 of Collin, Collin discloses that the display of information is mentioned which information can be used to assist the user in performing diagnostics such as modifying a configuration of a modem system to optimize communications between the computer system and another computer system. Furthermore, Collin does not disclose a diagnostic program provided for monitoring a printing press or at least the printer, only the possibility to perform diagnostics in a modem configuration is disclosed. Furthermore, only the word "diagnostics" is mentioned, there are not several diagnostic programs shown that are specific for certain parts of printing presses or at least printers. Therefore, Collin does not disclose to provide several diagnostic programs that can be selected depending on the type of a printing press.

Sridhar is only related to a distributive directory for enhanced network communication between a local computer and the remote system (column 5, lines 26 to 43). Sridhar does not disclose any diagnostic process and does not mention any diagnostic programs that are different depending on the printing press that the diagnosis is performed on.

The same is valid with respect to Waite, which also pertains to a communications network for communicating with computers

provided with different protocols. This kind of communication between two computers disclosed in column 2, lines 8 to 26 of Waite does not show any diagnostic programs to monitor a printer or a printing press. Waite only discloses that a computer can have peripheral devices such as a printer (44) and a CRT display (46) which communicates with the computer, (column 3, lines 44 to 46). The computer can transmit data either to the CRT (46) or the printer (44) or to a disc storage (column 4, lines 22 to 24).

Waite does not disclose to monitor the printer (44) and in particular the problem having printing presses with many configurations that need appropriate diagnostic programs is not addressed in Waite. This is because in Waite, there is only one printer (44) that is mentioned. Waite only refers to a communications network but does not address and solve any problems that occur if remote service on printing presses is done, the printing presses having various and different configurations that have to be taken into consideration when monitoring and servicing the printing presses. However, this problem is solved by claim 1, in that appropriate diagnostic programs being compatible with a certain printing press in a certain configuration are used.

A-2875 - Application No. 09/981,847
Response to Office action September 1, 2011
Response submitted October 26, 2011

A combination of Waite, Collin, and Sridhar does not result in the possibility to select the correct diagnostic program for a certain printing press.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the combination of references does not show or suggest displaying a specified number of diagnostic programs for monitoring a printing press connected to the second computing unit, selecting and starting one of the diagnostic programs via the first computing unit, transmitting results of the one diagnostic program to the first computing unit, and providing a table wherein diagnostic programs are assigned to specified printing presses, so that when establishing a connection, the diagnostic programs pertaining to a correct one of the specified printing presses are displayed for selection, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The combination of references applied by the Examiner **does not** result in all the claim limitations. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 8-9 stand rejected as being obvious over Sridhar (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,108) in view of Collin (International Publication No. WO 00/49501) and Waite (U.S. Patent No. 4,688,170) and further in view of Official Notice under 35

A-2875 - Application No. 09/981,847
Response to Office action September 1, 2011
Response submitted October 26, 2011

U.S.C. § 103. Official Notice does not make up for the deficiencies of Sridhar, Collin and Waite. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 8 and 9 are allowable as well.

Claim 13 stands rejected as being obvious over Sridhar (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,108), Collin (International Publication No. WO 00/49501) and Waite (U.S. Patent No. 4,688,170) and further in view of Kraslavsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,626) (hereinafter "Kraslavsky") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As noted above, claim 13 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection has been overcome.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 5-11 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone

A-2875 - Application No. 09/981,847
Response to Office action September 1, 2011
Response submitted October 26, 2011

call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:ab

October 26, 2011

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101